

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed September 21, 2007, claims 1, 2, 12, 13, 16, and 18 were rejected. Additionally, claims 3 – 11, 14, 15, 17, and 19 were objected to. Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the below-provided remarks.

For reference, claim 1 is amended to remove reference numbers PS01 and PS02. No other amendments have been made.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3 – 11, 14, 15, 17, and 19 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have not rewritten the claims at this time in view of the below-provided remarks.

Response to Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 12, 13, 16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cioffi (U.S. Pat. No. 6,781,452). Additionally, claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cioffi in view of Klomsdorf et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,151,947, hereinafter Klomsdorf). However, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable over Cioffi and Klomsdorf for the reasons provided below.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 recites in part:

“a power supply having power supply *outputs* for supplying *a first power supply voltage having a first level* and *a second power supply voltage having a second level* being higher than the first level.” (emphasis added)

In support of the rejection of the power supply of claim 1, the Office action cites “Fig. 6, V_{batt}, three way node of figure 6; Cioffi.” (Office action page 2, item 3) Applicants assert that the main supply, V_{battery}, and the three way node shown in Fig. 6 of Cioffi do not teach or suggest “a power supply having power supply outputs for supplying a first power supply

voltage having a first level and a second power supply voltage having a second level being higher than the first level” as recited in claim 1. In particular, a three way node connected to V_{batt} as depicted in Fig. 6 of Cioffi does not teach or suggest “a first power supply voltage having a first level and a second power supply voltage having a second level being higher than the first level” as recited in claim 1. The voltage at the three way node is a single voltage, V_{batt} , and therefore does not teach or suggest two different power supply voltages. Because Cioffi does not teach or suggest “a power supply having power supply outputs for supplying a first power supply voltage having a first level and a second power supply voltage having a second level being higher than the first level” as recited in claim 1, Applicants assert that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

Independent Claims 16 and 18

Independent claims 16 and 18 include similar limitations to claim 1. In view of the similarities between claims 16 and 18 and claim 1, Applicants assert that the remarks provided above in regard to claim 1 apply also to claims 16 and 18. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that independent claims 16 and 18 are not rendered obvious from Cioffi.

Dependent Claims 2 – 15, 17, and 19

Claims 2 – 15 are dependent on claim 1, claim 17 is dependent on claim 16, and claim 19 is dependent on claim 18. Applicants respectfully assert that claims 2 – 15, 17, and 19 are allowable at least based on allowable base claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-3444** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-3444** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: December 19, 2007

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111